

their property if an endangered species is found on the land.

Under last year's Supreme Court decision in *Kelo*, state and local governments now can take property from a private landowner in order to give or sell it to another private owner. So, we need to make sure Americans can protect their private property ownership.

The Private Property Rights Implementation Act of 2006 clarifies current law in order to give America's property owners those tools.

For instance, H.R. 4772 corrects an anomaly created by two Supreme Court decisions that prevents a property owner from having their federal takings claim decided in Federal Court without first pursuing the case in state court.

And the legislation clarifies that the standard for due process claims in a takings case is "arbitrary and capricious" and not the much higher "shocks the conscience" standard that some courts are using and that almost no property rights case can meet.

The bill also clarifies what constitutes a "final decision" on an acceptable land use from a regulatory agency for purposes of being able to take the claim to federal court.

Some regulatory agencies have avoided making such "final decisions" in order to prevent the property owner from moving forward with the property rights claim.

H.R. 4772 is a good bill that will protect Americans' property rights.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman CHABOT for offering this legislation, and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4772, the "Private Property Rights Implementation Act."

This bill strips local governments of their authority to enforce zoning regulations by allowing real estate developers to bypass the State courts and go directly to Federal courts to challenge local zoning decisions. While I strongly believe in the rights of property owners, zoning is an important tool of local governments to maintain livable communities where residents and businesses can coexist.

The city of New York opposes this legislation because it would intrude upon its authority over local land decisions. Additionally, this bill is opposed by a coalition of groups including the League of Conservation Voters, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Conference of State Legislatures.

I am puzzled about why the Republican Majority feels that this bill should be voted on before we adjourn when there are so many other issues like increasing the minimum wage and implementing the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission that have yet to be considered by this body.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate this opportunity to explain my concerns with the bill, H.R. 4772, the Private Property Rights Implementation Act of 2005. I oppose the bill because I am concerned that it will weaken local land use, zoning, and environmental laws by encouraging costly and unwarranted "takings" litigation in Federal court against local officials.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4772 would fundamentally alter the procedures governing regulatory takings litigation. Those procedures are required by the U.S. Constitution and have been

repeatedly reaffirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, as recently as last year. The bill purports to alter these requirements by giving developers, corporate hog farms, adult bookstores, and other takings claimants the ability to bypass local land use procedures and State courts. Indeed, the National Association of Home Builders candidly referred to a prior version of the bill as a "hammer to the head" of local officials. Developers could use this hammer to side-step land use negotiations and avoid compliance with local laws that protect neighboring property owners and the community at large.

In addition, section 5 of the bill purports to dramatically change substantive takings law as articulated by the Supreme Court and other Federal courts by redefining the constitutional rules that apply to permit conditions, subdivisions, and claims under the Due Process Clause. The existing rules, developed over many decades, allow courts to strike a fair balance between takings claimants, neighboring property owners, and the public. The proposed rules would tilt the playing field further in favor of corporate developers and other takings claimants, even in the many localities across the country where developers already have an advantage.

As a result, H.R. 4772 would allow big developers and other takings claimants to use the threat of premature Federal court litigation as a club to coerce small communities to approve projects that would harm the public. By short-circuiting local land use procedures, H.R. 4772 also would curtail democratic participation in local land use decisions by the very people who could be harmed by those decisions.

The bill also raises serious constitutional issues. The provisions that purport to redefine constitutional violations ignore the fundamental principle established in *Marbury v. Madison* (1803) that it is "emphatically the province and duty" of the Federal courts to interpret the meaning of the Constitution. Moreover, under longstanding precedent, a landowner has no claim against a State or local government under the Fifth Amendment until the claimant first seeks and is denied compensation in State court. Federal courts would continue to dismiss these claims, as well as claims that lack an adequate record where claimants use the bill to side-step local land use procedures. The bill will create more delay and confusion by offering the false hope of an immediate Federal forum for those who have not suffered a Federal constitutional injury. In short, this bill is a great threat to federalism, our local land use protections, neighboring property owners, and the environment. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote against the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1054, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5631) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes."

#### MILITARY COMMISSIONS ACT OF 2006

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1054, I call up the Senate bill (S. 3930) to authorize trial by military commission for violations of the law of war, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 3930

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Military Commissions Act of 2006".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Construction of Presidential authority to establish military commissions.
- Sec. 3. Military commissions.
- Sec. 4. Amendments to Uniform Code of Military Justice.
- Sec. 5. Treaty obligations not establishing grounds for certain claims.
- Sec. 6. Implementation of treaty obligations.
- Sec. 7. Habeas corpus matters.
- Sec. 8. Revisions to Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 relating to protection of certain United States Government personnel.
- Sec. 9. Review of judgments of military commissions.
- Sec. 10. Detention covered by review of decisions of Combatant Status Review Tribunals of propriety of detention.

#### SEC. 2. CONSTRUCTION OF PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MILITARY COMMISSIONS.

The authority to establish military commissions under chapter 47A of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 3(a), may not be construed to alter or limit the authority of the President under the Constitution of the United States and laws of the United States to establish military commissions for areas declared to be under martial law or in occupied territories should circumstances so require.